

SN



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/848,834	05/17/2004	Thomas J. Bachinski	12929.1077USC1	4798

7590 01/24/2005
Robert A. Kalinsky
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

BASICHAS, ALFRED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3749

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

9P

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/848,834	Applicant(s) BACHINSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Alfred Basichas	Art Unit 3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 26-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 26-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/17/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 26, 28, 29, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trowbridge (4,836,182), which shows all of the claimed limitations. Trowbridge discloses a gas-burning fireplace including substantially all of the claimed limitations, such as an air heating conduit 46, a blower 36, a grill 16, and a filter 18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3749

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 26, 28, 29, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lassy (3,930,490), which discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations. Lassy discloses, among other things, a fireplace including a separate plenum 30, an air intake filter (see at least col. 4, lines 16-17), and a blower 44. Lassy does not specifically recite the plenum as part of the overall structure of the fireplace. The fact that Lassy discloses an after market type structure does not preclude one of ordinary skill in the art from envisioning a contiguous single structure, which would require only routine skill in the art. Such an arrangement is simply a matter of design choice based on manufacturing and/or marketing considerations. Further, Official notice is given that such arrangements are old and well known in the art as clearly evident from the cited prior art of record. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 3749

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporated a single structure, rather than aftermarket add on, into the invention disclosed by Lassy, so as to comply with manufacturing and/or marketing design choice.

7. Claims 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trowbridge (4,836,182) or Lassy (3,930,490) in view of Morrow (5,656,242).

Trowbridge and Lassy disclose substantially all of the claimed limitations as discussed above, but do not specifically disclose UV sterilization or ion generation for further air purification. Morrow teaches an air purifier device including, among porous filters, UV sterilization 44 and electrostatic filter 18 in order to purge the air of contaminants.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the UV and electrostatic filtering taught by Morrow into the inventions disclosed by Trowbridge or Lassy, so as to effectively purge the air of contaminants.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 703 306 3476. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennett can be reached on 703 308 0101. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9302 for regular communications and 703 872 9303 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3749

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0861.

January 14, 2005



Alfred Basicas
703 306 3476